1	OSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CASBN 44332) Inited States Attorney				
2	BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973) Chief, Criminal Division				
4 5 6 7 8 9	CHAD M. MANDELL (ILBN 6286783) Special Assistant United States Attorney 150 Almaden Boulevard San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5059 Facsimile: (408) 535-5066 Email: chad.mandell@usdoj.gov Attorneys for the United States of America UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT			
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
13					
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. CR 08-00337 RMW			
15	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]			
16	v.	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JUNE 2, 2008 TO JULY 31, 2008 FROM THE			
17	LUIS REBOLLA-SANCHEZ	SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A))			
18	Defendant.				
19					
20					
21	The parties stipulate that the time between June 2, 2008 and July 31, 2008 is excluded under				
22	the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested				
23	continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective				
24	preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the				
25	ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the				
26	public, and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases.				
27					
28	//				

	Case 5:08-cr-00337-RMW	Document 10	Filed 06/05/2008	Page 2 of 3
1	18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).			
2				
3	DATED: June 2, 2008		P. RUSSONIELLO	
4		United Sta	ates Attorney	
5		/s/		
6		CHAD M. MANDELL Special Assistant United States Attorney		
7				
8		/s/		
9		MANUEL U. ARAUJO Lead Defense Attorney		
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20 21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				

1 ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between June 2, 2008 to July 31, 2008 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

RONALD M. WHYTE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE